UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/598,115	08/17/2006	John E. Oldenburg	L0786-01160PUS2	1253	
2292 7590 05/12/2009 BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 EALL S CHURCH NA 22040 0747			EXAMINER		
			BLAU, STEPHEN LUTHER		
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3711		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			05/12/2009	ELECTRONIC	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Interview Summary	10/598,115	OLDENBURG, J	OHN E.
interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Stephen L. Blau	3711	
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO	personnel):		
(1) <u>Stephen L. Blau</u> .	(3)		
(2) <u>Leonard R. Svensson (Reg. No. 30,330)</u> .	(4)		
Date of Interview: 29 April 2009.			
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)⊡ Video Conference c)⊡ Personal [copy given to: 1)⊡ applicant 2	)∏ applicant's representative	·]	
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description:	e) No.		
Claim(s) discussed: <u>12-20</u> .			
Identification of prior art discussed: None.			
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g	)⊠ was not reached. h)□ N	I/A.	
Substance of Interview including description of the general reached, or any other comments: <u>Discussed the action date</u> the same as being exactly identical. <u>Discussed how prior at take into account manfacturing inaccuracies</u> . <u>Discussed hot filed disclosure to use such word in the claims of this application</u> (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendallowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no continuous discussions in the claims of the same of the s	ed 26 March 2009. Discussed of patents have used the work ow the word substantially would ation.  The word substantially would be a substantially	d how the Examinated substantially in the substantially in the substantially in the substantial to be in the substantial tender would render the substantial tender s	ner interprets n order to the originally er the claims
allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached		odia romati mo	olali 110
THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE A INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTIFILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERPROPERTY.	last Office action has already OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY ERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, V	been filed, APP ' DAYS FROM T WHICHEVER IS	LICANT IS THIS LATER, TO
/Stephen L. Blau/			